adequately track these felons. For instance, in California, 33,000, or 44 percent of registered offenders are missing; it is estimated that states on average are unable to account for 24 percent of sex offenders.

Recently, the Supreme Court ruled against challenges from Alaska and Connecticut, and upheld current law pertaining to sexual offender registries. With the support of both Congress and the highest court of our land, it is inconceivable to me that we now allow bookkeeping challenges to deter law enforcements' ability to identify and locate child predators.

This bill makes several important changes to improve the tracking of sex offenders and the recovery of missing children. The bill: modifies the definition of ''minimally sufficient program'' to include: the registration of all convicted sex offenders prior to release; the collection of information to assist in tracking individuals, including a DNA sample, current photograph, driver's license and vehicle information; and verification of address and employment information for all offenders every 90 days. Modifies penalties for non-compliance with registry requirements. It provides that State programs must designate non-compliance as a felony and permits the issuance of a warrant. This provision is intended to encourage compliance by offenders as well as provide a tool for law enforcement and prosecutors. Improves the chances for recovering missing children and aids law enforcement in solving cases by preventing the removal of missing children from the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) database. Improves the chances for recovery of missing children by requiring entry of child information into the NCIC database within 2 hours.

We must make the tracking of convicted sex offenders and the post-release supervision of child sexual predators a higher priority. Since most sex offenders are in the community, we must ensure there is continuing contact and supervision of released sex offenders. Data management challenges are simply inexcusable reasons for not protecting our innocent children from crimes committed against them.

We have an obligation to protect our children from the abductors, sex offenders and sexual predators who prey on our children. I urge my colleagues to join myself, Senator COLLINS and Senator HATCH in supporting and furthering this legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 151—ELIMINATING SECRET SENATE HOLDS

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LUGAR, and Ms. LANDRIEU) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 151

Resolved,

SECTION 1. ELIMINATING SECRET SENATE HOLDS.

Rule VII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end the following:

''7. A Senator who provides notice to party leadership of his or her intention to object to proceeding to a motion or matter shall disclose the notice of objection (or hold) in the Congressional Record in a section reserved for such notices not later than 2 session days after the date of the notice.''.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I am resubmitting a Senate resolution to amend the Standing Rules of the United States Senate to eliminate the practice of secret holds. I'm pleased that I am once again joined by my colleague, Senator WYDEN, in this effort. Senator WYDEN and I have been working together on this issue for some time and we have made some progress in bringing this issue to light and having it addressed. Still, the problem continues to reoccur and a permanent solution is needed.

I know many of my colleagues are well aware of the practice of placing an anonymous ''hold'' on a piece of legislation or a nomination. Some Senators have been victims of a secret hold placed on one of their bills and others may have used this practice.

Holds are not explicitly mentioned anywhere in the Senate Rules, but they derive from the rules and traditions of the Senate where a single Senator possesses a great deal of power to derail any matter. In order for the Senate to run smoothly, objections to unanimous consent agreements must be avoided. Essentially, a hold is a notice by a Senator to his or her party leader of an intention to object to bringing a bill or nomination to the floor for consideration. If the Majority Leader were to attempt to bring a matter up for consideration despite an objection, the Senate would be forced to consider the motion to proceed, which would be subject to a filibuster. Because this kind of delay would paralyze the working of the Senate, holds are usually honored as both a practical necessity and a senatorial courtesy.

A Senator might place a hold on a piece of legislation or a nomination because of legitimate concerns about an aspect of a bill or a nominee. However, there is no legitimate reason why a Senator placing a hold on a matter should remain anonymous.

I believe in the principle of open government. Lack of transparency in the public policy process leads to cynicism and distrust of public officials. I would maintain that the use of secret holds damages public confidence in the institution of the Senate.

It has been my policy to disclose in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any hold that I place on any matter in the Senate along with my reasons for doing so. I know Senator WYDEN does the same. I have used holds in the past when I thought a matter was progressing too fast and more questions needed to be answered. However, I feel that my colleagues have a right to know that it was GRASSLEY that placed the hold as well as why I did it.

As a practical matter, other members of the Senate need to be made aware of an individual senator's concerns. How else can those concerns be addressed? As a matter of principle, the American people need to be made aware of any action that prevents a matter from being considered by their elected senators.

Senator WYDEN and I have worked twice to get a similar ban on secret holds included in legislation passed by the Senate. But, both times it was removed in conference.

Then, at the beginning of the 106th Congress, Senate Leaders LOTT and DASCHLE circulated a letter informing senators of a new policy regarding the use of holds. The Lott/Daschle letter stated, '' . . . all members wishing to place a hold on any legislation or executive calendar business shall notify the sponsor of the legislation and the committee of jurisdiction of their concerns.''

This agreement was billed as marking the end of secret holds in the Senate. Unfortunately, this policy has not been followed consistently. Secret holds have continued to appear in the Senate. Last year, Senator WYDEN and I decided that we needed to continue to pursue a permanent change in the Senate Rules to end this practice and we introduced a Senate resolution to do just that. We were later joined by Senators LUGAR and LANDRIEU and I was glad to have their support. We are now submitting that same measure and I am encouraged that Rules Committee Chairman LOTT has expressed interest in examining our legislation and the problem of secret holds.

The Grassley-Wyden resolution would add a section to the Senate Rules requiring that Senators make public any hold placed on a matter within two session days of notifying his or her party leadership. This change will lead to more open dialogue and more constructive debate in the Senate.

Ending secret holds will make the workings of the Senate more transparent. It will reduce secrecy and public cynicism along with it. Moreover, this reform will improve the institutional reputation of the Senate. I look forward to working with Chairman LOTT and all my colleagues to address the problem of secret holds and hopefully make progress toward ending this distasteful practice once and for all.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, for seven years Senator GRASSLEY and I have teamed up in a bipartisan way to champion the cause of the sunshine hold in the United States Senate. The sunshine hold is the less popular step sister of the more commonly used ''secret'' hold.

Even though it is one of the Senate's most popular procedures, neither the sunshine nor the secret ''hold'' can be found anywhere in the United States Constitution or in the Senate Rules. It

is one of the most powerful weapons that any Senator can wield in this body, and in its stealth version, known as the ''secret hold,'' it is far more potent and far more insidious.

The ''hold'' in the Senate is a lot like the seventh inning stretch in baseball: there is no official rule or regulation that talks about it, but it has been observed for so long that it has become a tradition.

Today, Senator GRASSLEY and I are resubmitting the resolution we sponsored in the 107th Congress to amend the Senate Rules to require that any Senator who wishes to object to a measure or matter publish that objection in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within 48 hours. The resolution does not in any way limit the privilege of any Senator to place a ''hold'' on a measure or matter. It is the anonymous hold that is so odious to the basic premise of our democratic system: that the exercise of power always should be accompanied by public accountability. Our resolution would bring the anonymous hold out of the shadows of the Senate. The resolution would assure that the awesome power possessed by an individual Senator to stop legislation or a nomination should be accompanied by public accountability.

Beginning in 1997 and again in 1998, the United States Senate voted unanimously in favor of amendments Senator GRASSLEY and I offered to require that a notice of intent to object be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within 48 hours. The amendments, however, never survived conference.

So we took our case directly to the leadership at that time, and to their credit, TOM DASCHLE and TRENT LOTT agreed it was time to make a change. They recognized the significant need for more openness in the way the United States Senate conducts its business so TOM DASCHLE and TRENT LOTT sent a joint letter in February 1999, to all Senators setting forth a policy requiring ''all Senators wishing to place a hold on any legislation or executive calender business [to] notify the sponsor of the legislation and the committee of jurisdiction of their concerns.'' The letter said that ''written notification should be provided to the respective Leader stating their intentions regarding the bill or nomination,'' and that ''holds placed on items by a member of a personal or committee staff will not be honored unless accompanied by a written notification from the objecting Senator by the end of the following business day.''

At first, this action by the Leaders seemed to make a real difference. Many Senators were more open about their holds, and staff could no longer slap a hold on a bill with a quick phone call. But after six to eight months, the clouds moved in on the sunshine hold and the Senate began to slip back towards the old ways. Abuses of the ''holds'' policy began to proliferate, staff-initiated holds-by-phone began anew, and it wasn't too long before legislative gridlock set in and the Senate seemed to have forgotten what Senators DASCHLE and LOTT had tried to do.

My own assessment of the situation now, which is not based on any scientific evidence, GAO investigation or CRS study, is that a significant number of our colleagues in the Senate have gotten the message sent by the Leaders, and have refrained from the use of secret holds. They inform sponsors about their objections, and do not allow their staff to place a hold without their approval. My sense is that the legislative gridlock generated by secret holds may be attributed to a relatively small number of Senate offices. The resolution we are submitting today will not be disruptive for a solid number of Senators, but it will up the ante on those who may be ''chronic abusers'' of the Leaders' policy on holds.

The requirement for public notice of a hold two days after the intent has been conveyed to the leadership may prove to be an inconvenience but not a hardship. No Senator will ever be thrown in jail for failing to give public notice of a hold. Senators routinely place statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD recognizing the achievements of a local Boys and Girls Club, or congratulating a local sports team on a State championship. Surely the intent of a Senator to block the progress of legislation or a nomination should be considered of equal importance.

I have adhered to a policy of publicly announcing my intent to object to a measure or matter. This practice has not been a burden or inconvenience. On the contrary, my experience with the public disclosure of holds is that my objections are usually dealt with in an expeditious manner, thereby enabling the Senate to proceed with its business.

Although this is not the ''high season'' for holds, the time is not far off when legislation will become bogged down in the swamp of secret holds. The practice of anonymous multiple or rolling holds is more akin to legislative guerilla warfare than to the way the Senate should conduct its business.

It is time to drain the swamp of secret holds. The resolution we submit today will be referred to the Senate Committee on Rules. It is my hope that the Committee will take this resolution seriously, hold public hearings on it and give it a thorough vetting. This is one of the most awesome powers held by anyone in American government. It has been used countless times to stall and strangle legislation. It is time to bring accountability to the procedure and to the American people, and to put sunshine holds in the Senate Rules.

SENATE RESOLUTION 152—WELCOMING THE PRESIDENT OF THE PHILIPPINES TO THE UNITED STATES, EXPRESSING GRATITUDE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES FOR ITS STRONG COOPERATION WITH THE UNITED STATES IN THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST TERRORISM AND ITS MEMBERSHIP IN THE COALITION TO DISARM IRAQ, AND REAFFIRMING THE COMMITMENT OF CONGRESS TO THE CONTINUOUS EXPANSION OF FRIENDSHIP AND COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. LUGAR (for himself and Mr. BIDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 152

Whereas the United States and the Philippines have shared a special relationship as close friends for more than a century;

Whereas the United States and the Philippines have been allies for more than 50 years under the Mutual Defense Treaty which was signed at Washington on August 30, 1951 (3 UST 3947);

Whereas the United States and the Philippines share a common commitment to democracy, human rights, and freedom;

Whereas the United States and the Philippines share a common goal of bringing peace, stability and prosperity to the Asia-Pacific region;

Whereas the President of the Philippines, Her Excellency Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo, was the first leader in Asia to commit full support for the United States and its war against global terror after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001;

Whereas the Governments of the United States and the Philippines have effectively joined forces to combat the terrorist threat in Southeast Asia and are collaborating on a comprehensive political, economic, and security program designed to defeat terrorist threats in the Philippines, including those from Muslim extremists, Communist insurgents and international terrorists;

Whereas the Governments of the United States and the Philippines believe that, in light of growing evidence that links exist between entities in the Philippines and international terrorist groups, the two countries should enhance their cooperative efforts to combat international terrorism;

Whereas the Government of the United States welcomes and will assist the efforts of the Government of the Philippines to forge a lasting peace, protect human rights, and promote economic development on the island of Mindanao;

Whereas President Arroyo has fully supported the United States position on Iraq, including joining the coalition to enact change in Iraq and arranging to send a humanitarian contingent to help the newly liberated people of that country;

Whereas the United States welcomes the strong statements by President Arroyo on the need for North Korea to accept international norms on non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction;

Whereas the United States fully supports the campaign of President Arroyo to implement economic and political reforms and to build a strong Republic in the Philippines to defend Philippine democracy from terror and to strengthen the Philippines as an ally of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate